

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP (SIG)  
OCTOBER 7, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m. via conference call)**

SIG members present: Steve Campi, Karen Garrison, Joel Greenberg, Nancy Hastings, Bill James, Ken Kurtis, Roberta Larson, Jesus Ruiz, Linda Sheehan

**Others present:** Phil Isenberg (Chair, MLPA BRTF), Francine Edralin (note taker; MLPA Initiative staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff), Jack Peveler (listening for Carol Abella)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), geographic information system (GIS), marine protected area (MPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)

### **Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call**

A warm welcome was extended to the SIG members participating by BRTF chair, and this meeting's facilitator, Phil Isenberg.

### **Update on the Central Coast Project**

John Kirilin updated SIG members on the recent activities of the CCP. John Kirilin reports that there are currently no membership changes. The CCRSG just wrapped up the October meeting in Monterey, and the November meeting will be held in Cambria on the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>. The final CCRSG meeting will be held in Monterey on December 6 and 7.

The October meeting went well; interaction between the stakeholder members was quite positive and many fears were quieted down as concerns were able to be expressed. The four small working groups worked well to achieve goals of different interests. MLPA and DFG staff were available to work with the groups. The meeting also focused on learning the GIS tool that is used to draw lines on maps; this tool can be effective when looking at groups of MPAs.

Progress was made at the October meeting regarding individual MPAs. Acceptable proposals will either suggest modifications or propose new MPAs and are due October 15. These proposals will be reviewed by the CCRSG for consideration. The October CCRSG meeting left MLPA Initiative staff hopeful in the ability to send a proposal to the BRTF and then by DFG to F&GC. The November CCRSG meeting in Cambria will be centered on understanding the concepts from the previous meeting, and shaping those concepts into packages. The December meeting will clarify areas of agreement.

Overall, the CCP is in fine form with a good design to make completion of the project in December 2005.

## **Comments**

Chair Isenberg noted that the tone of the meeting proved to be, and will continue to be, important to the CCRSG's work.

A SIG member congratulated the MLPA staff at the approach taken toward the CCRSG. MLPA staff commented that a lot of work went into the preparation for these meetings. The CCRSG ground rules were especially important in setting a positive tone to get the project's objectives accomplished.

Another SIG member was amazed at the CCRSG's progress and how well things have moved forward. He asked how the decision tool worked and more importantly how effective the tool is. John Kirlin answered that he thinks it works well and will prove to be valuable; it helps with the drawing of lines, and that is useful. The GIS tool allows you to pull up the data layers below line drawings. It'll prove to be more useful as we move forward. He also noted that online usage is limited to members of the stakeholder group.

Chairman Isenberg asked a SIG member what he thinks the group is doing correctly procedure-wise, so that they can continue to do so. The SIG member answered that the group thoroughly reacts, especially to time compression. If a topic drops off the table at a meeting, it's revisited at future meetings for discussion.

A SIG member noted that the cross sector groups are very affective. To hear others communicate their concerns in small groups about various sites and interests is not only important, but valuable.

A SIG member provided feedback regarding the sub groups. He felt that one group in particular got stuck on procedure and didn't get around to using the GIS mapping tool.

Another SIG member had a question regarding the SAT participation in the stakeholder group. What is the effect on species that already have a quota through traditional fisheries management, such as groundfish? Will or can the total allowable catch (TAC) be changed when MPAs are implemented? The SIG member feels this question has not been addressed and that the fishermen need to understand the bottom line once MPAs are put into place. John Kirlin suggested that this question be taken directly to the SAT.

## **September Task Force Meeting**

The September BRTF meeting was abbreviated into a long, one day session. Things that went right/wrong:

- Issues moved along nicely
- A few items that were important to stakeholders floated past the meeting because of time compression
- BRTF members made good inquiries regarding science questions

## **Open Discussion**

Jack Peveler brought up the citing of MLPA by harbors. When MPAs are designated, what restrictions are going to be put on harbors? He just wants to know that this issue is being addressed. John Kirlin answered that the concern is well represented in the stakeholder group, as some members and alternates on the CCRSG are harbormasters.

Kevin Cooper heard something about restrictions being listed on sea otters at the Channel Islands. Steve Campi answered that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is seeking comments on their sea otter plan, where they propose not to restrict sea otter range or relocate any sea otters. The public has until January 2006 to comment on the plan.

Linda Sheehan asked a question regarding the science presentations, and wanted to know the time frame of the water quality draft. John Kirlin answered that a good first draft was presented at the last SAT meeting. Ken Schiff is working on a draft revision, and this will be discussed further at the October 18 SAT meeting.

## **Future meeting dates**

October 18, 2005: SAT meeting in San Luis Obispo

November 9-8, 2005: CCRSG meeting in Morro Bay. This meeting will focus on creating packages of MPAs and on network design.

November 29-30, 2005: BRTF meeting in Monterey/Santa Cruz. This meeting will be the first time the task force members will see what the CCRSG is working with and perhaps the first and only chance to look at the long term funding report. The long term funding report is one of the five deliverables under the initiative. Craig Brown and Tim Gage are preparing the first draft and will attend to the BRTF meeting to talk about the range of proposals. John Kirlin will ask them how much money we are seeking to raise and the new budget claims since the introduction of the Ocean Protection Council. Also brought to the table will be the SAT presentation on network design if it is available.

Chair Isenberg inquires if the BRTF will be asked to adopt anything related to the CCP. John Kirlin answered that they won't, but rather this meeting will serve as information regarding the packages and identification of whether the packages as being designed meet the requirements of the MLPA. Chair Isenberg wants to encourage public comment for the BRTF meeting.

Mid-March 2006 will be the final BRTF meeting before the deadline for making recommendations to DFG for the central coast. Chair Isenberg added that the meeting will be in mid-March or earlier and the BRTF will be making its recommendations based on the CCRSG's hard work.

## **Wrap Up**

A SIG member had questions regarding SAT issues. Current stock assessment models are having difficulty functioning when MPAs are present. How much sampling information is needed for regional models, how localized, and how much of it needs to be conducted? John Ugoretz responded that DFG is spending money on this issue, and he wants to see results. The SIG member specifically wants the SAT to discuss this issue; he added that as the monitoring and evaluation plan is being prepared, staff should remember the lessons learned from the CRANE data collection and monitoring at Channel Islands.

John Kirlin responded that the SAT will discuss what has gone right/wrong with the Channel Islands, and what lessons we can learn; it will be a small discussion as there is urgency to move on.

Chair Isenberg thanked everyone for a productive meeting and then adjourned the meeting.